

**EPA Superfund
Record of Decision:**

**JACKSONVILLE NAVAL AIR STATION
EPA ID: FL6170024412
OU 02
JACKSONVILLE, FL
09/21/1995**

Text:

INTERIM RECORD OF DECISION

POTENTIAL SOURCE OF CONTAMINATION (PSC) 42
OPERABLE UNIT 2

NAVAL AIR STATION JACKSONVILLE
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

Unit Identification Code (UIC): N00207

Contract No. N62467-89-D-0317/076

Prepared by:

ABB Environmental Services, Inc.
2590 Executive Center Circle, East
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Prepared for:

Department of the Navy, Southern Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
2155 Eagle Drive
North Charleston, South Carolina 29418

Dana Gaskins, Code 1857, Engineer-in-Charge

June 1995

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 4
241 COURTLAND STREET NE
ATLANTA GEORGIA 30363

4WD-FFB

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Captain R. D. Whitmire
Commanding Officer
Naval Air Station

.~

Jacksonville, Florida 32212-5000

SUBJ: Interim Remedial Action Record of Decision
Operable Unit Two - PSC 42
NAS Jacksonville, EPA I.D. FL6 170 024 412

Dear Captain Whitmire:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the Department of the Navy's Interim Remedial Action Record of Decision (IROD) for Operable Unit Two - PSC 42 at Naval Air Station (NAS) Jacksonville pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended. EPA concurs with the findings and the selected remedy presented in the IROD.

Sincerely,

John H. Hankinson, Jr.
Regional Administrator

cc: Virginia B. Wetherell, Secretary
Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Captain R. S. Tyler, USN, Commanding Officer
Southern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command

CERTIFICATION OF TECHNICAL
DATA CONFORMITY (MAY 1987)

The Contractor, ABB Environmental Services, Inc., hereby certifies that, to-the best of its knowledge and belief, the technical data delivered herewith under Contract No. N62467-89-D-0317/76 are complete and accurate, and they comply with all requirements of this contract.

DATE: June 2, 1995

NAME AND TITLE OF CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Peter Redfern
Task Order Manager

NAME AND TITLE OF CERTIFYING OFFICIAL: Mike Dunaway
Project Technical Lead

(DFAR 252.227-7036)

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Interim Record of Decision
PSC 42 at OU 2

Chapter	Title	Page No.
1.0	DECLARATION FOR THE INTERIM RECORD OF DECISION	1-1
1.1	SITE NAME AND LOCATION	1-1
1.2	STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSE	1-1
1.3	ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE	1-1
1.4	DESCRIPTION OF THE SELECTED REMEDY	1-1
1.5	STATUTORY STATEMENT	1-10
1.6	SIGNATURE AND SUPPORT AGENCY ACCEPTANCE OF THE REMEDY	1-10
2.0	DECISION SUMMARY	2-1
2.1	SITE NAME, LOCATION, AND DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.2	SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES	2-1
2.3	HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION	2-2
2.4	SCOPE AND ROLE OF INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTION	2-3
2.5	SITE CHARACTERISTICS	2-3
2.6	SUMMARY OF SITE RISKS	2-4
2.7	SELECTED REMEDY	2-5
2.8	STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS	2-5
2.9	DOCUMENTATION OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES	2-6

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Responsiveness Summary

IROD_PSC.42

ASW.06.95

GLOSSARY

ABB-ES	ABB Environmental Services, Inc.
AOC	area of concern
ARARs	applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAMU	corrective action management units
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CPC	contaminants of potential concern
CWA	Clean Water Act
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FDER	Florida Department of Environmental Regulation
FFA	Federal Facility Agreement
FRE	Focused Risk Evaluation
FRI	Focused Remedial Investigation
FFS	Focused Feasibility Study
FS	Feasibility Study
FOTW	federally owned treatment works

IROD	Interim Record of Decision
LDR	Land Disposal Restrictions
LNAPL	light nonaqueous-phase liquid
mg/kg	milligrams per kilogram
µg/kg	micrograms per kilogram
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NAS	Naval Air Station
NCP	National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
O&M	operation and maintenance
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Act
OU	Operable Unit
PAH	polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons
PA/SI	Preliminary Assessment and Site Inspection
PCBs	polychlorinated biphenyls
PM10	particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
POTW	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
PSC	potential source of contamination
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RI	Remedial Investigation
IROD_PSC.42	
ASW.06.95	

GLOSSARY (Continued)

SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act
SVOCs	semivolatile organic compounds
TAL	target analyte list
TCL	target compound list
TC	toxicity characteristic
TPH	total petroleum hydrocarbons
TSD	treatment, storage, and disposal
TU	temporary units
USC	United States Code
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VOCs	volatile organic compounds

IROD_PSC.42
ASW.06.95

1.0 DECLARATION FOR THE INTERIM RECORD OF DECISION

1.1 SITE NAME AND LOCATION. The site name is Operable Unit (OU) 2, Potential source of contamination (PSC) 42 (wastewater treatment plant effluent polishing pond) located at the Naval Air Station (NAS) Jacksonville in Jacksonville, Florida (Figures 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3).

1.2 STATEMENT OF BASIS AND PURPOSE. This decision document presents the selected interim remedial action for source control at PSC 42 at OU 2, NAS Jacksonville. The selected action was chosen in accordance with the requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986. This decision document explains the factual basis and rationale for selecting the interim remedy at PSC 42. The information supporting this interim remedial action decision is contained in the Administrative Record for this site, which is located at the Charles D. Webb Wesconnett Branch of the Jacksonville Public Library.

The purpose of the interim remedial action for PSC 42 is to lower the risk of potential future exposure to humans and the environment by reducing the leachability of contaminated media at PSC 42 to groundwater, and to close the pond in accordance with Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) closure requirements. Upon completion of the overall Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) for OU 2, the need for remedial action to address groundwater contamination will be evaluated. A complete RCRA closure of PSC 42 will be addressed in the overall RI/FS for OU 2.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the State of Florida's Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) concur on the selected interim remedy.

1.3 ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE. Actual or threatened releases of metals from the site, if not addressed by implementing the response actions selected in the Interim Record of Decision (IROD), may violate RCRA closure requirements, and leave a potential groundwater contaminant. If not addressed, this could present a future risk to human health and the environment.

1.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE SELECTED REMEDY. OU 2 is one of three OUs presently identified at NAS Jacksonville, Florida. This section describes the selected remedy for PSC 42, the wastewater treatment plant effluent polishing pond, at OU 2.

The preferred interim action for source control at PSG 42 is Alternative 3, developed and evaluated in the Focused Remedial Investigation and Focused Feasibility Study (FRI/FFS) for PSCs 3 and 42 at OU 2. Alternative 3 proposes stabilizing the pond sludge and the standing pond water in situ. This and other alternatives considered for PSC 42 are summarized in Table 1-1. The major components of the selected remedy include:

Table 1-1

Comparative Analysis of Remedial Alternatives for PSC 42

Interim Record of Decision Operable Unit 2
Naval Air Station Jacksonville
Jacksonville, Florida

	Alternative 1: Onsite ex-situ	Alternative 2: Offsite
stabilization	Alternative 3: In-situ stabilization	
treat-	stabilization and onsite re-deposi-	and offsite disposal of the
any surface water.	tion of the treated polishing pond	ed polishing pond sludge.
water	sludge without containment.	Dewatering of the surface
Criterion	Dewatering of the surface water	in the polishing pond,
pretreat-	in the polishing pond, pretreat-	ment, and discharge to the
	ment and discharge to the Feder-	FOTW.
	ally owned treatment works	
	(FOTW).	

Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment

How risks are eliminat-	Alternative 1 would provide an	Analysis is the same as for
Alter-	Alternative 3 would provide an	
ed, reduced, or con-	increased level of protection of	native 1. However, since
the	increased level of protection of	sludge is treated and
trolled	human health and the environ-	offsite, there will be no
disposed	human health and the environ-	nant migration.
contami-	sent. By stabilizing the sludge,	
and surface water, contaminant	contaminant migration is mini-	
migration is minimized, thereby	sized thereby reducing the risks	

	posed by the contaminants.	
reducing the risks posed by the	Following pretreatment contami-	
contaminants.	nant concentrations are reduced to acceptable levels that would not pose a threat to human health and environment.	
Short-term or	No short-term or cross-media	Analysis is the same aa for
Alter-	Analysis is the same as for Alter-	
cross-media effects	effects ere expected for the im-	native 1.
native 1.	plementation of this alternative.	
Compliance with ARARs		
Chemical-, location-,	This alternative will comply with	Analysis is the same as for
Alter-	Analysis is the same as for Alter-	
and action-specific	all ARARs concerned. It will also	native 1.
native 1.		
ARARs	comply with the RCRA closure plan approved for PSC 42 at OU 2.	
Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence		
Magnitude of residual	The magnitude of residual risk	There will be no residual
risk	The magnitude of residual risk	
risk	due to the sludge at the site is	from the sludge since it
will be	due to the sludge and surface	treated and disposed
offsite.	minimal. The stabilization pro-	
residual	cess used to stabilize the sludge	Also, there will be no
since	stabilization process used to	risk from the surface water
prior	will reduce the possibility of con-	it will undergo pretreatment
of contaminants leaching to the	taminants leaching to the	to discharge to the FOTW.
groundwater as well as direct	groundwater ae well as direct	
exposure.	exposure. There will be no resid-	
	ual risk from the surface water	
	since it will undergo pretreat-	
	ment prior to discharge to the	
	FOTW.	
Adequacy of Controls	Stabilization processes have	The analysis will be the
same as	The analysis will be the same as	
except-	been determined to be long term	for alternative 1 with the
treat-	for alternative 1 with the excep-	tion that the sludge will be
	source control technologies.	ed and disposed offsite.
	tion that the sludge and the	
	Therefore, the sludge will have	

surface water will be stabilized
 and will have long-term source
 control.

long term source control. Since
 the surface water will be treated
 onsite prior to discharge to the
 FOTW and final discharge to the
 St. Johns River according to
 NPDES regulations, source con-
 trol will not be an issue.

See notes at end of table.

IROD_PSC.42
 ASW.06.95

Table 1-1 (Continued)

Comparative Analysis of Remedial Alternatives for PSC 42

Interim Record of Decision Operable Unit 2
 Naval Air Station Jacksonville
 Jacksonville, Florida

stabilization treat- any surface water. water Criterion pretreat-	Alternative 1: Onsite ex-situ	Alternative 2: Offsite
	Alternative 3: In-situ stabilizatlon stabilization and onsite re-deposi- tion of the polishing pond sludge and sludge without containment.	and offsite disposal of the ed polishing pond sludge.
	Dewatering of the surface water in the polishing pond, pretreat- ment and discharge to the Feder- ally owned treatment works (FOTW).	Dewatering of the surface in the polishing pond, ment, and discharge to the FOTW.

Long-term Effectiveness and Permanence--continued

Reliability of controls and alternative the	Stabilization is a highly reliable Analysis is the same as for AIter- source control technology. native 1.	Since the sludge is treated disposed offsite, this gives the best controls of three alternatives.
--	---	--

Reduction of Mobility, Toxicity, or Volume

Treatment process and	The sludge would be treated	The treatment process and
-----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

the	The sludge and surface water	
remedy	onsite, ex-situ and disclosed	remedy is the same as for
alter-	will be treated in-situ, onsite	native 1, however, the
sludge	onsite without containment. The	
	surface water will be treated	will be treated and disposed
	onsite, sent to the FOTW and	offsite.
	then discharged to the St. Johns	
	River.	
Amount of hazardous	The total sludge volume of ap-	Analysis is the same as for
Alter-	Analysis is the same as for Alter-	
material destroyed or	proximately 9.000 cubic yards	native 1.
native 1 with the exception of		
treated	and 4 million gallons of surface	
the surface water being stabil-	water will be stabilized and treat-	
lized as well as the sludge.	ed respectively.	
Reduction of mobility,	The mobility and the toxicity of	Analysis is the same as for
Alter-	Analysis is the same as for Alter-	
toxicity, or volume	the sludge contaminants will be	native 1. However, the
treat-	native 1. However, since the	ment and disposal of the
through treatment	reduced due to the binding that	is done offsite and
sludge	stabilization is done in-situ the	alternative best reduces the
therefore, this	takes place between the contam-	mobility, toxicity and the
could be less than is alternative	reduction of mobility and toxicity	of the sludge.
volume	inants and the additives. How-	
mass including surface water	ever, the volume of the sludge	
and sludge will be increased in	1. The volume of the stabilized	
the range of 40 to 50 percent	would increase after the treat-	
with the addition of stabilizing	ment process due to the addi-	
reagents.	tives that will be introduced	
	during the treatment process.	
	This volume increase will be in	
	the range of 20 to 50 percent.	
	The toxicity of the surface water	
	will also be reduced after the	
	pretreatment and treatment at	
	the FOTW, however, the water	
	will be discharged to the St.	
	Johns River. There will be no	
	increment in the treated volume	
	of surface water.	
Irreversibility of treat-	Stabilization processes are highly	Analysis is the same as for
Alter-	Analysis is the same as for Alter-	

ment irreversible on the long term. In native 1.
 native 1. However, since the other words, the bonds between
 mixing is done in-situ the reverse-
 ability could be more in this alter-
 natives do not reverse on the long
 native.
 term. The treatment of surface
 water is also irreversible.

See notes at end of table.

IROD_PSC.42
 ASW.06.95

Table 1-1 (Continued)

Comparative Analysis of Remedial Alternatives for PSC 42

Interim Record of Decision. Operable Unit 2
 Naval Air Station Jacksonville
 Jacksonville, Florida

	Alternative 1: Onsite ex-situ	Alternative 2: Offsite
stabilization	Alternative 3: In-situ stabilization	
treat-	stabilization and onsite re-deposi-	and offsite disposal of the
any surface water.	tion of the treated polishing pond	ed polishing pond sludge.
water	sludge without containment.	Dewatering of the surface
Criterion	Dewatering of the surface water	in the polishing pond,
pretreat-	in the polishing pond, pretreat-	ment, and discharge to the
	ment and discharge to the Feder-	FOTW.
	ally owned treatment works	
	(FOTW).	

Reduction of Mobility, Toxicity, or Volume--continued

Type and quantity of	The treatment residual of the	Analysis is the same as for
Alter-	The treatment residual of the	
treatment residual	sludge would be a solid material	native 1.
sludge and surface water would	with an increase in volume in the	
be solid material with an in-	range of 20 to 50 percent of the	
crease in volume in the range of	original sludge volume. The	
40 to 50 percent.	treated surface water would be	
	a liquid with no change in vol-	

ume.

Short-Term Effectiveness

Protection of communi- Alter- ty during remedial ac- trans- tion volatilization will would be monitored during stabi- lization operations. Work area would be fenced off to control access.	If required, dust and noise con- trol would be implemented dur- ing dredging and dewatering operations. Volatilization of sludge contaminants would be monitored during dredging opera- tions. Work area would be fenced off to control access.	Analysis is the same as for native 1 except that during port of sludge the of the sludge contaminants be controlled with foam and covering.
Protection of workers Alter- during remedial actions native 1.	Workers would be required to follow an approved Health and Safety Plan. Underground utili- ties in the vicinity will be located and staked before intrusive work. There are risks associated with operating stabilization and dewatering equipment which will be addressed in the Health and Safety Plan.	Analysis is the same as for native 1.
Environmental effects Alter- native 1.	No effects are expected to the groundwater. Releases of con- taminants or particulate to air are expected to have minimal envi- ronmental effect.	Analysis is the same as for native 1.
Time until remedial Approximately 2 to 4 months action objectives are complete achieved the project.	Approximately 3 to 6 months would be required to complete the project.	Approximately 3 to 6 months would be required to the project.

See notes at end of table.

Table 1-1 (Continued)

Comparative Analysis of Remedial Alternatives for PSC 42

Interim Record of Decision Operable Unit 2
Naval Air Station Jacksonville
Jacksonville, Florida

stabilization treat- any surface water. water Criterion pretreat-	Alternative 1: Onsite ex-situ	Alternative 2: Offsite
	Alternative 3: In-situ stabilization stabilization and onsite re-deposi- tion of the treated polishing pond sludge without containment.	and offsite disposal of the ed polishing pond sludge.
	Dewatering of the surface water in the polishing pond, pretreat- ment and discharge to the Feder- ally owned treatment works (FOTW).	Dewatering of the surface in the polishing pond, ment, and discharge to the FOTW.
Implementability		
Ability to construct Analysis is the same as for technology Alternative 1. The handling of the sludge material and surface water will be the least difficult in this alternative.	Stabilization is a widely used technology in metal contamina- tion. Stabilization vendors con- duct their work onsite (i.e.. using mobile unit) or offsite (i.e., at or near a disposal facili- ty). Dewatering companies are located locally. The handling of the sludge material will be the most difficult in this alter- native.	Analysis is the same as for Alternative I.
Reliability of technology Alter- landfills are other sites with similar waste contami- fills, onsite in situ stabilization	Stabilization is proven technol- Oneite stabilization has been ogy for sludge contaminated implemented successfully at with metals. Many proven tech- nologies exist for pretreatment of streams. Unlike regulated land- the water pollutant present.	Analysis is the same as for native 1. Regulated designed and constructed to minimize leaching of nants.

does not have leaching or runoff

control protocols.

Ease of undertaking	Implementation of this alterna-
Alter-	Care would have to be taken to
additional remedial ac-	tive would pose no impediment
avoid unnecessary disturbance	
tion, if necessary	to additional remedialion.
of the stabilized treated wastes	

Analysis is the same as for
native 1.

when undertaking additional
investigations or remedial ac-
tions. Disturbing these areas is
undesirable because it may
provide pathways for reversal of
treatment and weakening of the
structural integrity of the stabi-
lized media.

Monitoring consider-	Air monitoring would be con-
Alter-	Analysis is the same as for Alter-
ations	ducted as appropriate during
native 1.	excavation and transportation.

Analysis is the same as for
native 1.

Coordination with other	Coordination with NAS Jackson-
Alter-	Analysis is the same as for Alter-
agencies	ville personnel would be required
native 1.	
	for the duration of remedial
	activities. Coordination with
	USEPA, FDEP, county and land-
	fill regulatory agencies would be
	necessary.

Analysis is the same as for
native 1.

See total cost and notes on following page.

IROD_PSC.42
ASW.06.95

Table 1-1 (Continued)
Comparative Analysis of Remedial Alternatives for PSC 42

Naval Air Station Jacksonville
Jacksonville, Florida

<p>stabilization treat- any surface water. water Criterion pretreat-</p>	<p>Alternative 1: Onsite ex-situ Alternative 3: In-situ stabilization stabilization and onsite re-deposi- tion of the treated polishing pond sludge without containment. Dewatering of the surface water in the polishing pond, pretreat- ment and discharge to the Feder- ally owned treatment works (FOTW).</p>	<p>Alternative 2: Offsite and offsite disposal of the ed polishing pond sludge. Dewatering of the surface in the polishing pond, ment, and discharge to the FOTW.</p>
<p>Implementability--con- tinued</p>		
<p>Availability and capaci- for ty of treatment, stor- stabi- age, and disposal ser- be con- vices facility done to necessary to prevent pond would yards percent stabili-</p>	<p>Stabilization will be conducted in Stabilization will be conducted in an onsite stabilization unit. This situ for the sludge material and unit will have enough capacity to surface water. A volume in- crease of 40 to 50 percent is sludge. The pond has enough expected. Berming and lining capacity for the redeposition of the pond perimeter will ,be the treated material. The FOTW has a treatment capacity of overflow and provide additional about 3 million gallons/day and it treatment capacity. currently runs at half its capaci- ty.</p>	<p>The analysis is the same as alternative 1, however, the lization and disposal will ducted offsite. The where the stabilization is should have enough capacity process 9,000 cubic yards of sludge. Also, the facility use up about 12,000 cubic of capacity (assuming 50 increase in volume due to zation).</p>
<p>Analysis is the same as for Alter- native 1.</p>		
<p>Ability to obtain approv- Alter- als from other agencies native 1.</p>	<p>Once the Interim Record of Deci- Analysis is the same as for Alter- sion (IROD) is signed the approv- al from the USEPA and the FDEP</p>	<p>Analysis is the same as for native 1.</p>

is granted. Other local regulatory approval will be obtained before remedial action begins.

TOTAL COST	3,520,000	6,050,850 (without
contingen-	2,605,000	cy for transportation)

Notes: PSC = potential source of contamination.
RI/FS = Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study.
NAS = Naval Air Station.
ARARs = applicable or relevant end appropriate requirements.
OU = operable unit.
VOCs = volatile organic compounds.
CERCLA = Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.
USEPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
FDEP = Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
RCRA = Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.
O&M = operating and maintenance.

IROD_PSC.42
ASW.06.95

site preparation and installation of the in situ mobile stabilization unit

berming and lining the area surrounding the pond perimeter to prevent pond overflow.

in situ stabilization of polishing pond sludge and water, and

demobilization and site restoration.

Implementation of the interim action will lower the risk of potential future exposure to humans and the environment by reducing the leachability of contaminated media, and will close PSC 42 in accordance with RCRA closure requirements. The Navy estimates that the preferred alternative will cost \$2,605,000 to construct and will take 2 to 4 months to implement.

1.5 STATUTORY STATEMENT. This interim action is protective of human health and the environment, complies with Federal and State applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) for this limited scope of action, and is cost effective. Tables 1-2 and 1-3 summarize ARARs for the interim remedial action. Although this interim action is not intended to fully address the statutory mandate for permanence and treatment to the maximum extent practicable, this action uses treatment for contaminated materials and debris and, thus, is in furtherance of that statutory mandate. Because this action does not constitute the final remedy for contaminated groundwater at OU 2, the statutory preference for remedies that employ treatments that reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume as a principal element will be addressed by the final response action(s) for groundwater. This interim action does address the reduction of toxicity and mobility for contaminated materials (soil) considered in this remedy. Subsequent actions are planned to address the potential threats posed by the conditions in the groundwater at OU 2.

Because this is an IROD, review of this site and of this remedy will be ongoing as the Navy continues to develop final remedial alternatives for OU 2.

1.6 SIGNATURE AND SUPPORT AGENCY ACCEPTANCE OF THE REMEDY

Captain R.E. Resavage
Commanding Officer, NAS Jacksonville

Date

IROD_PSC.42
ASW.06.95

site preparation and installation of the in situ mobile stabilization unit,

berming and lining the area surrounding the pond perimeter to prevent pond
overflow,

in situ stabilization of polishing pond sludge and water, and

demobilization and site restoration.

Implementation of the interim action will lower the risk of protective future exposure to humans and the environment by reducing the leachability of contaminated media, and will close PSC 42 in accordance with RCRA closure requirements. The Navy estimates that the preferred alternative will cost \$2,605,000 to construct and will take 2 to months to implement.

1.5 STATUTORY STATEMENT. This interim action is protective of human health and the environment, complies with Federal and State applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARARs) for this limited scope of action, and is cost effective. Tables 1-2 and 1-3 summarize ARARs for the interim remedial action. Although this interim action is not intended to fully address the statutory mandate for permanence and treatment to the maximum extent practicable, this action uses treatment for contaminated materials and debris and, thus, is in furtherance of that statutory mandate. Because this action does not constitute the final remedy for contaminated groundwater at OU 2, the statutory preference for remedies that employ treatments that reduce toxicity, mobility, or volume as a principal element will be addressed by the final response action(s) for groundwater. This interim action does address the reduction of toxicity and mobility for contaminated materials (soil) considered in this remedy. Subsequent actions are planned to address the potential threats posed by the conditions in the groundwater at OU 2.

Because this is an IROD, review of this site and of this remedy will be on ongoing as the Navy continues to develop final remedial alternatives for OU 2.

L.6 SIGNATURE AND SUPPORT AGENCY ACCEPTANCE OF THE REMEDY

Captain R.D. Resavage
Commanding Officer, NAS Jacksonville

Date

Table 1-2
Synopsis of Potential Federal and State Chemical-Specific ARARs for PSC

Interim Record of Decision, Operable Unit 2
Naval Air Station Jacksonville
Jacksonville, Florida

Federal Standards and Requirements	Requirements Synopsis
Consideration in the Remedial Response Process	
Occupational Safety and Health exposure Standards are applicable for worker exposure to OSHA hazardous Act (OSHA), Occupational chemicals during remedial activities. Health and Safety Regulations [29 CFR Part 1910, Subpart Z]	Establishes permissible exposure limits for workplace exposure to a specific listing of Chemicals.
Resource Conservation and hazardous Recovery Act (RCRA), Identifi- acceptable management approaches for listed and characteristically cation and Listing of Hazardous hazardous wastes that should be incorporated into the characterization Wastes [40 CFR Part 261] and remediation elements of remedial response at PSC 42.	Defines those solid wastes subject to regulation as wastes under 40 CFR Parts 262-265.
RCRA, Releases from Solid units This rule is relevant and appropriate for Comprehensive Environmental Waste Management Units [40 Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) sites contaminated CFR Part 264, Subpart F] with RCRA hazardous constituents, and potential applicable requirements for groundwater remediation executed under the RCRA Corrective Action period, Program. However, these requirements are not applicable to Superfund sites unless the action involves active placement in regulated units after July 26, 1982.	Establishes the requirements for solid waste management (SWMUs) at RCRA regulated temporary storage and disposal (TSD) facilities. The scope of the regulation encompasses groundwater protection standards (RCRA maximum contaminant levels [MCLs]), point of compliance, compliance and requirements for groundwater monitoring.

Notes: ARARs = applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements.
CFR = code of Federal Regulations.

Table 1-3
Synopsis of Action-Specific Federal and State Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)
for Potential Source of Contamination (PSC) 42 at Operable Unit (OU) 2

Interim Record of Decision, Operable Unit 2
Naval Air Station Jacksonville
Jacksonville, Florida

Federal or State Standards and Requirements Consideration in the Remedial Response Process	Status	Requirements Synopsis
Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) Regulations, Occupational Health and Safety Regulations 129 CFR, Part 1910, Subpart Z]	Applicable	Establishes permissible exposure limits for workplace. The remedial alternative at PSC 42 will require workers to be exposed to a specific listing of chemicals. Therefore, exposure limits set forth in this regulation are applicable.
RCRA Regulations, Closure and Post-Closure [40 CFR Part 264]	Relevant and appropriate	Details general requirements for closure and of hazardous waste facilities, including groundwater monitoring program. The corrective action plan will be revised to reflect the response action selected through the CERCLA process.
RCRA Regulations, Surface Impoundments [40 CFR Part 264, Subpart K]	Relevant and appropriate	Applies to owners and operators that use Because this remedial action involves the placement of RCRA-poundments to treat, store, or dispose of regulated hazardous wastes in surface impoundments, this regulation is relevant and appropriate. Closure requirements should be considered for remedial actions for surface impoundments.
RCRA Regulations, Use and Management of Containers [40 CFR, Part 264, Subpart I]	Relevant and appropriate	Sets standards for the storage of containers of hazardous waste. If the implementation of the remedial alternative involves the waste. storage of containers containing RCRA-regulated waste onsite, the substantive requirements established in this rule will be met.
RCRA Regulations, Land Treatment [40 CFR Part 264, Subpart L]	Relevant and appropriate	Establishes procedures and operating The treatment alternative of hazardous waste should meet the both closure and post-closure of land substantive construction, monitoring, operational, and closure standards established within this regulation.
See notes at end of table.		

Table 1-31 (Continued)

Synopsis of Action-Specific Federal and State Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs)

for Potential Source of Contamination (PSC) 42 at Operable Unit (OU) 2

Interim Record of Decision, Operable Unit 2
Navel Air Station Jacksonville
Jacksonville, Florida

Federal or State Standards Consideration in the Remedial Response Process and Requirements	Status	Requirements Synopsis
RCRA Regulations, Waste requirements for Piles [40 CFR Part 264, piles. If removal or Subpart L] is not possible for landfills	Relevant and Because the remedial action chosen involves the placement of appropriate CERCLA generated RCRA listed hazardous waste in waste piles, the substantive requirements established in this rule will be met.	Establishes procedures and operating both closure and post-closure of waste deoontamination of all contaminated subsoil ble, closure and post-closure requirements must be attained.
Solid Waste Disposal Act which solid Regulations, Criteria for Class- pose a reasonable sification of Solid Waste Dis- health or the posal Facilities and Practices prohibited open 142 USC 6901-6987 and 40 CFR Part 257)	Applicable For waste identified as non-hazardous the substantive require- ments of this rule will be met.	Established criteria for use in determining waste disposal facilities and practices probability of adverse effect on public environment and, therefore, constitute dumps.
Chapter 62.730, FAC, Florida 40 CFR and Hazardous Waste Rule, August 1990 regulations concern- transportation, and	Relevant and Both the substantive and permitting requirements of this regula- appropriate tion will be considered in design of the remedy.	Adopts by reference appropriate section of establishes minor additions to these ing the generation, storage, treatment, disposal of hazardous wastes.
Department of Transportation for packaging, Rules for Transportation of materials. Hazardous Materials [49 CFR analysis, treatment, or disposal. Parts 107, 117, 173, 148, and 179]	Applicable Requirements established in this rule will be met during trans- portation of hazardous material from the site for laboratory	This regulation established the procedures labeling, and transporting of hazardous

RCRA Regulations, LDRs for management of Newly Listed Wastes and performance Hazardous Debris [40 CFR, 1 of 17 approved Parts 148, 260, 261,262, 264, USEPA that the 265, 270, and 271] (3) treat the an "equiva- treat the debris to contaminating the regulations,	Relevant and If debris is encountered as part of the interim remedial action, appropriate one of the four management options for hazardous debris will be implemented.	This rule sets forth four options for hazardous debris: (1) treat the debris to standards established in this rule through technologies, (2) obtain a ruling from debris no longer contains hazardous debris, debris using a technology approved through lent technology demonstration," or (4) existing LDR standards for wastes debris and continue to manage under RCRA Subtitle C.
--	--	--

See notes at end of table

Table 1-3 (Continued)

Synopsis of Action-Specific Federal and State Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARARs) for Potential Source of Contamination (PSC) 42 at Operable Unit (OU) 2

Interim Record of Decision, Operable Unit 2
Naval Air Station Jacksonville
Jacksonville, Florida

Federal or State Standards and Consideration in the Remedial Response Process Requirements	Status	Requirements Synopsis
Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) Regulations, General Industry Standards [29 CFR, Part 1910]	Applicable	This act requires establishment of programs to assure worker health and safety at hazardous waste sites, in- the site, requirements of these regulations must be maintained. cluding employee training requirements.
OSHA Regulations, Recordkeeping and reporting requirements defined in this rule Recordkeeping, Reporting, and Related Regulations [29 CFR, Part 1904]	Applicable	Provides recordkeeping and reporting requirements applicable to remedial activities.
OSHA Regulations, Health and	Applicable	Specifies the type of safety training, equipment, All phases of the remedial response project should be executed

and Safety Standards [29		procedures to be used during site investigation
and	in compliance with this regulation.	
CFR, Part 1926]		remediation.
Chapter 62-4, FAC, Florida	Applicable	Establishes procedures for obtaining permits for
sources of	Substantive permitting requirements of this rule will be met	
Rules on Permits, May 1991		pollution.
during the remedial action at PSC 42.		
Chapter 62-736, FAC,	Applicable	Requires warning signs at National Priority List
(NPL) and	Because Naval Air Station Jacksonville is currently listed on the	
Florida Rules on Hazardous		FDEP (formerly FDER) identified hazardous waste
sites to	NPL, this requirement is applicable.	
Waste Warning Signs, August		inform the public of the presence of potentially
harmful		
1994		conditions.

Notes: NAS = naval air station.
 CFR = Code of Federal Regulations.
 CERCLA = Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act.
 CWA = Clean Water Act.
 POTW = publicly owned treatment works.
 FOTW = federally owned treatment works.
 USC = U.S. Code.
 FAC = Florida Administrative code.
 USEPA = U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
 FDEP = Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
 FDER = Florida Department of Environmental Regulation.

2.0 DECISION SUMMARY

2.1 SITE NAME, LOCATION, AND DESCRIPTION. NAS Jacksonville is located in Duval County, Florida, on the western bank of the St Johns River: OU 2 is located in the northern Part of the installation (Figure 1-3). The official mission of NAS Jacksonville is to provide facilities service, and managerial support for the operation and maintenance of naval weapons and aircraft to operating forces of the U S. Navy as designated by the Chief of Naval Operations. Some of the tasks required to accomplish this mission include operation of fuel storage facilities, performance of aircraft maintenance, maintenance and operation of engine repair facilities and test cells for turbojet engines, and support of special weapons systems.

The land use west of OU 2 is primarily residential and recreational. The Timuquana Country Club and Golf Course border OU 2 to the west. Access to the country club is restricted to members and guests. Two private residences abut the NAS boundary on the northwest side of OU 2 near the St. Johns River. A residential area (trailer park) also abuts the NAS boundary west of the Timuquana Country Club; the distance from this trailer park to OU 2 is about 3,000 feet. Access to OU 2 is limited because of its proximity to the NAS taxiways and runways, which have additional security requirements. A chainlink fence along the base boundary and continuous patrols make access, by unauthorized personnel unlikely and limited.

2.2 SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES. The area incorporated into NAS

Jacksonville has been used for U.S. Navy operations since 1940. OU 2, which is located on the northern part of NAS Jacksonville, has historically been used primarily for wastewater treatment. Its secondary use has been for fire-fighting training.

Past operations at the wastewater treatment plant located within OU 2 that possibly affected soil quality include:

drying sludge in unlined beds (PSCs 41 and 43),

discharge of treated water to an unlined polishing pond (PSC 42), and

land disposal of sludge removed from the drying beds (PSCs 3 and 4).

In addition to the treatment plant, a former fire-fighting training area (PSC 2) is located within OU 2. Burning fuels within the unlined pit at the training area has affected soil quality at PSC 2.

Probable waste materials disposed of at OU 2 include aviation fuel and waste petroleum products (at the former fire-fighting training area), inorganic and organic compounds (at the domestic and industrial wastewater sludge drying beds), and asbestos (at PSC 4). PSC 4 will be evaluated during the site-wide Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) to be conducted in 1995. An FRI/FFS study has been completed for PSCs 2, 41, and 43, and the IROD was signed on September 29, 1994. Interim remedial action for PSCs 2, 41, and 43 is scheduled to occur in 1995. An FRI/FFS has also been completed at PSCs 3 and 42. As a result of this FRI/FFS, it was determined that there was no need for an interim remedial action at PSC 3. Therefore, PSC 3 will be included in the site-wide RI/FS with PSC 4. Investigations and site history of PSC 42 are described briefly in the following paragraphs.

IROD_PSC.42

ASW.06.95

2-

PSC 42 is the wastewater treatment plant effluent polishing pond. It has a capacity of approximately 5.7 million gallons and was built in 1970 to provide final clarification and settling for approximately 2.3 million gallons per day of treated wastewater effluent. It currently contains water from precipitation and seepage from groundwater. The pond was removed from service in 1987. It appears that the surface water level in the polishing pond is controlled by both rainfall events and fluctuations in the groundwater elevation.

The USEPA classified the polishing pond as a surface water impoundment to treat RCRA-listed hazardous wastes F006 and F019 (i.e., wastewater treatment sludge from electroplating operations and from the chemical conversion coating of aluminum) (Process Code T02). The hazardous constituents for which the sludge is listed consist of cadmium, hexavalent chromium, nickel, and cyanide (complexed) for F006 and hexavalent chromium and cyanide (complexed) for F019.

In 1988, after a review of groundwater monitoring data, the FDEP issued a Consent Order requiring closure of the effluent polishing pond. In response to the Consent Order, NAS Jacksonville developed a closure plan for the wastewater treatment plant polishing pond (PSC 42). This closure plan also included PSCs 41 and 43 at OU 2, and in September 1991, FDEP issued a permit for closure and post-closure at PSCs 41, 42, and

43.

As provided in Section VII of the Federal Facility Agreement (FFA), parties should intend to integrate the Navy's CERCLA response obligations and RCRA corrective action obligations into any remedial actions. As such, the FFA establishes the mechanism whereby remediation of the PSC will occur under the provisions of CERCLA with RCRA considered as an ARAR with respect to releases of hazardous waste. Further, the FFA states that permits shall be modified again after the CERCLA process has resulted in the final selection of a remedial action.

PSC 42 has been investigated for groundwater compliance with RCRA standards since 1983. Monitoring wells in the vicinity of the pond were sampled and analyzed quarterly for 1 year beginning in 1984 in accordance with an FDEP and RCRA closure and post-closure permit. Inorganic constituents exceeded permit standards at the point of compliance monitoring wells in the shallow aquifer zone.

During July 1994, PSC 42 was included in a sampling event to assess the potential or actual contamination of surface water, sediment, and biota at three surface water bodies located within NAS Jacksonville, and to report any constituent concentrations that were greater than standards or guidelines established by the Federal ambient water quality criteria or Florida surface water classification standards. Details concerning this event can be found in the Sampling Event Report Number 17, Electrofishing Fisheries Investigation at Selected Water Bodies, Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida (ABB-Environmental Services, Inc. [ABB-ES] 1993b). Sediment samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs), semivolatile organic compounds (SVOCs), pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and inorganics. According to the Sampling Event Report Number 17, PSC 42 contained levels of inorganic compounds above background levels in surface water and sediment samples.

2.3 HIGHLIGHTS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION. The FRI/FFS report for PSC 42 at OU 2 and the Proposed Plan were completed and released to the public on May 10, 1995. These documents and other Installation Restoration program information are available for public review in the Information Repository and Administrative Record. The repository

IROD_PSC.42
ASW.06.95

2-

is maintained at the Charles D. Webb Wesconnett Branch of the Jacksonville Public Library in Jacksonville, Florida. The notice of availability of these documents was published in The Florida Times Union on May 10, 1995.

A 30-day public comment period was held from May 10, 1995, to June 9, 1995. Written comments were received during the public comment period. Written comments and questions asked by the public are summarized and addressed in Appendix A, Responsiveness Summary.

2.4 SCOPE AND ROLE OF INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTION. A focused risk evaluation (FRE) was conducted on the soil surrounding the polishing pond, PSC 42. The FRE did not address the sludge and water present in the polishing pond; however, these materials are being treated as part of this remedial action. A risk assessment on the soil surrounding the pond indicated unacceptable risks were not predicted from exposure to surface soil at PSC 42 for either humans, terrestrial wildlife, plants, or soil invertebrates.

RCRA closure requirements support removal of the source. Therefore, source removal was determined to be the interim remedial action objective for PSC 42. The interim remedial action objective for PSC 42 is to reduce future potential risks to human health and the environment and comply with the RCRA closure plan approved for this PSC, as discussed in the FRI/FFS report. Metal contaminants are potentially acting as a continuing source of soil and groundwater contamination at OU 2. The purpose of this interim remedial action is to remove this source of contamination to the soil and groundwater at OU 2. Based on previous investigations and the evaluation of ARARs for this site, the interim remedial action identified is in situ stabilization of the polishing pond sludge and standing water.

Upon completion of the overall RI/FS for OU 2, the need for remedial action to address groundwater contamination will be evaluated. This IROD addresses an interim source control for contaminated materials at PSC 42 and is consistent with any future remedial activities that may take place at the site.

2.5 SITE CHARACTERISTICS. Sampling and analysis of soil, surface water, and sediment found within the effluent polishing pond (PSC 42) were completed as part of the focused RI/FS investigation conducted in September 1994. Soil and sediment samples were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, pesticides, PCBs, and inorganics. Surface water samples from the polishing pond were analyzed for target analyte list (TAL) inorganics and miscellaneous wet chemistry parameters. In addition to analyzing the surface water and sediment within the polishing pond, surface soil samples around the perimeter of the pond were analyzed to investigate the possible migration of contaminants from the potential of past flooding and maintenance activities. All surface soil and sediment samples were first screened for the following metals: arsenic, cadmium, chromium, lead, and nickel. The list of selected metals for screening is based on previous soil and groundwater analytical results (ABB-ES, 1992b). Based on the findings of the screening, the soil and sediment were analyzed for TAL inorganics. As part of the base-wide groundwater modeling effort conducted in collaboration with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), four piezometer wells were installed on the south and west sides (potentially upgradient) of PSC 42. In addition to groundwater elevation data, groundwater samples were collected and analyzed for contaminants of potential concern (CPC), target compound list (TCL), and TAL parameters and selected water quality tests from the four piezometer wells and two existing downgradient wells. Groundwater data

IROD_PSC.42

ASW.06.95

collection was intended to provide data to support an evaluation of remedial alternatives at PSC 42. The results of the FRI/FFS investigation, which was designed to characterize the extent of metal contamination at PSC 42, are summarized in this section.

Surrounding soil, surface water, and sediment samples at PSC 42 contained inorganics related to the operation of the polishing pond. Fifty-six soil samples were collected from the soil surrounding the pond for screening of the five metals. From the screening data, chromium, lead, and cadmium were the most often detected metals in the soil around PSC 42. Chromium and lead were detected in all 56 samples collected (including 6 field duplicates). All of the detections of chromium were above background concentrations, whereas only 40 percent of the lead samples were above

background concentrations. Cadmium was detected in 46 of 56 samples and nickel was detected in 7 of 56 samples. All detections of cadmium and nickel were above background concentrations. Arsenic was below detection limits in all 56 screening samples collected. Twelve samples were collected for TAL inorganic analytical results to confirm the detection of the above selected screening metals. Lead was detected in all 12 samples (including 2 field duplicates), chromium was detected in 11 of 12 samples, and cadmium was detected in 7 of 12 samples. Iron and aluminum were present in all 12 samples. Antimony, arsenic, barium, beryllium, copper, magnesium, nickel, potassium, sodium, thallium, and vanadium were not detected. Soil samples from areas surrounding the effluent polishing pond were also found to contain a pesticide, which does not appear to be related to PSC 42 operations and may have been a result of past base-wide pest control programs.

Seventeen sediment samples (including two field duplicates) were collected for screening of the five metals. From the screening data, chromium, cadmium, lead, and nickel were detected in all 17 samples (including 2 field duplicates). There was no detection of arsenic in the sediment samples. Four sediment samples were collected for TAL inorganic analyses to confirm the detection of the above selected screening metals. Fifteen TAL inorganic parameters were detected in all four sediment samples. Antimony, arsenic, and selenium were detected in one of the four samples, and sodium and nickel were detected in two of four samples. There are no detections of cobalt, potassium, or thallium. Two of seventeen sediment samples were submitted for total and hexavalent chromium analysis. Hexavalent chromium was not detected in the sample, indicating that the chromium in the sediment is most likely in the trivalent oxidation state.

Three surface samples in the pond were collected and analyzed for TAL inorganics. Metals detected in all three surface water samples include aluminum, barium, calcium, chromium, iron, lead, magnesium, manganese, nickel, potassium, and sodium. Zinc was not detected in two of three samples. There were no detections of antimony, arsenic, cadmium, copper, mercury, selenium, silver, vanadium, and cyanide.

Investigation of groundwater at PSC 42 in the FRI/FFS was conducted solely for the purpose of gathering data to support an evaluation of remedial alternatives for the sediment and surface water. A full evaluation of the groundwater analytical data was deferred until the execution of the overall OU2 RI/FS report.

2.6 SUMMARY OF SITE RISKS. An FRE was completed as a means of characterizing potential risks to humans and the environment that could be attributed to exposure to contaminants present in the soil surrounding the polishing pond, PSC 42. The FRE did not address the sludge and water present in PSC 42 (polishing pond); however, these

IROD_PSC.42
ASW.06.95

materials are being treated as part of this remedial action. A risk assessment on the soil surrounding the pond indicated unacceptable risks were not predicted from exposure to surface soil at PSC 42 for either humans, terrestrial wildlife, plants, or soil invertebrates. However, RCRA closure requirements support removal of the source, the sediment and surrounding surface soil, to comply with ARARs for PSC 42.

2.7 SELECTED REMEDY. Of the three alternatives evaluated, the selected interim

remedial action for source control at the PSC 42 at OU 2 is Alternative 3, described in the FRI/FFS report for OU 2. Alternative 3 involves:

site preparation and installation of the in situ mobile stabilization unit,
berming and lining the area surrounding the pond perimeter to prevent pond overflow,
in situ stabilization of polishing pond sludge and water, and
demobilization and site restoration.

The concentrations of contaminants in the materials at PSC 42 are above the RCRA Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) treatment standards for those hazardous wastes and, thus, would require treatment prior to disposal. As previously discussed, the materials are contaminated with metals. The treatment technology proposed in this alternative is in situ stabilization, which involves immobilizing the metals in the contaminated material by adding a setting agent such as Portland cement. Metals are not destroyed by this treatment process, but rather become physically and chemically entrapped in the resulting material, which can take the form of a semisolid to a solid. Long-term monitoring of this treated soil is contemplated under RCRA and will be incorporated in the final remedy for OU 2.

The sides of the polishing pond will be bermed to the necessary elevation to provide room for the added stabilization mixture; i.e., concrete, sand, and any reagents. After the in situ stabilization process, the product and contaminated pond water will remain in place.

Once treatment is completed, the site will be graded and seeded for revegetation. All equipment and features associated with the interim remediation would be removed at the end of the process.

The Navy estimates the total cost of this interim remedial action to be \$2,605,000 to construct and maintain.

2.8 STATUTORY DETERMINATIONS. The interim remedial action selected for implementation at PSC 42 is consistent with CERCLA and the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Contingency Plan (NCP). The selected remedies are protective of human health and the environment, attain ARARs, and are cost effective. The selected remedies also satisfy the statutory preference for remedial treatment of metals that significantly reduces the mobility, toxicity, or volume of hazardous substances as a principal element. Because this remedy is not intended as the final action for remediation of the contaminated soil and groundwater at OU 2, the statutory preference for treatment of this media will be addressed during the final FS for OU 2. Long-term monitoring of

IROD_PSC.42
ASW.06.95

this treated soil is contemplated under RCRA and will also be incorporated into the final remedy for OU 2.

Additionally, the selected remedy uses alternate treatment technologies or resource

recovery technologies to the maximum extent practicable. Because this remedy is not intended as the final remedial effort for groundwater at OU 2, any contaminated media remaining onsite after this interim remedial action will be addressed during the overall RI/FS for OU 2 and the resulting Record of Decision.

2.9 DOCUMENTATION OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES. There are no significant changes in this interim remedial action from that described in the Proposed Plan.

IROD_PSC.42
ASW.06.95

APPENDIX A
RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

Appendix A, Responsiveness Summary

The Responsiveness Summary serves three purposes. First, it provides regulatory agencies with information about the community preferences regarding the remedial alternatives presented for Potential Source of Contamination (PSC) 42, at Operable Unit (OU) 2, Naval Air Station (NAS) Jacksonville. Second, the Responsiveness Summary documents how public comments have been considered and integrated into the decision-making process. Third, it provides the Navy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), and Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) with the opportunity to respond to each comment submitted.

The Focused Remedial Investigation and Focused Feasibility Study for PSCs 3 and 42 and the Proposed Plan for PSC 42 were made available in an information repository maintained at the Charles D. Webb Wesconnett Branch of the Jacksonville Public Library.

The following comments were received during the public comment period.

Responsiveness Summary	
Interim Record of Decision	
Potential Source of Contamination 42 at Operable Unit 2	
Naval Air Station Jacksonville	
Jacksonville, Florida	
Comment	Response
NO COMMENTS RECEIVED	